REMARKS

Claims 1-28 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 10, and 18 have been cancelled, and new claims 26, 27, and 28 have been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

SECTION 103(a) REJECTIONS

All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Simons (Understanding Active Directory Replication, pages 171-180), in view of Ericsson et al. (SyncML Protocol, version 1.0.1), and further in view of Wang (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0019614).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims 1-25. Consider claim 26, for example, which states:

> **responsive to a replication request received from the network server,**
> replicating an object instance,
> creating a notification message, and
> queuing the object instance and notification message;

The cited art does not teach or suggest this subject matter. Ericsson does not disclose that object instances and notification messages created in response to a replication request may be queued at the synchronization server. Rather, in Ericsson as described by Fig. 10, the "sync alert" is sent upon receipt of a "sync order" from a user. As described in each of the independent claims, the notification message and object instance are not sent to the mobile device in response to a replication request, rather they are queued and may be sent in response to a periodic polling request from the mobile device.

Neither Simons nor Wang disclose that an object instance is replicated and a notification message is created and both are queued in response to a replication request from the network server.

> **responsive to a periodic polling request received from the mobile device,** sending the notification message to the mobile device;

The cited art does not teach or suggest this subject matter. The Office Action stated that Ericsson discloses "creating a notification message and sending the notification message to the mobile device (p. 49, fig. 10, sync alert from server to client to alert the client to perform sync) in response to a polling request received from the mobile device (fig. 10, polling occurs during when client and server initialize communication with each other)." However, in the system

- 6 -

disclosed by Ericsson, the sync alert is not sent in response to a polling request from the mobile device. Rather, it appears from Fig. 10 of Ericsson that the sync alert is sent in response to a "Sync order" from a User who submits that Sync order to the SyncML server. Therefore, the cited art does not teach sending a notification message to the mobile device in response to a periodic polling request from that mobile device.

Additionally, the cited art does not teach a periodic polling request as claimed by Applicants. The Office Action stated that in Ericsson "polling occurs during when client and server initialize communication with each other." However, the polling request as claimed is a *periodic* message to the synchronization server requesting messages for the mobile device. In the system as shown in Fig. 10 of Ericsson, prior to the sync order being sent from the User to the SyncML Server followed by a sync alert to the SyncML client, there is only a state in which "Client and server [are] configured to properly enable communication with each other." Ericsson does not disclose that the mobile device requests messages upon initialization, nor does it disclose a polling request being periodically sent from the mobile device to the server.

Neither Simons nor Wang disclose sending a notification message to a mobile device in response to a periodic polling request from the mobile device. Nor do these references disclose sending a replicated object instance to the mobile device in response to a synchronization request received from the mobile device.

As stated above, the cited art does not teach or suggest the claimed subject matter. While the cited references disclose systems for synchronization of data between devices, they do not disclose the claimed methods of sending multiple messages between the network server and synchronization server, and the mobile device and synchronization server. The claimed methods, although requiring a greater number of messages, allow for maintenance of data consistency when data updates among the various devices are infrequent or inconsistent.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and arguments, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

DC01 668408 v2

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments which may be incurred in connection with this paper under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17 to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: <u>August 3, 2007</u>

/Brett N. Watkins/
Brett N. Watkins
Registration No. 60,458

KENYON & KENYON, LLP
1500 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Ph.:   (202) 220-4200
Fax.:   (202) 220-4201